SQ736

Sample Questions for the Entry Level Examination for Immigration Officer Occupations

The examination for Immigration Officer occupations measures the thinking skills that are critical for making decisions and solving problems on the job. The sample questions presented in this booklet are similar to the questions you will find in the actual examination. In general, the questions deal with topics that are related to Government business. *Remember, however, that no job knowledge is required to answer the questions correctly*.

LOGICAL REASONING

In each of these questions you will be given a paragraph which contains all the information necessary to identify the correct answer. Use **only** the information provided in the paragraph. Do not speculate or make assumptions that go beyond this information. Also, assume that all information given in the paragraph is true, even if it conflicts with some fact that is known to you.

In some questions you will be asked to select the only response option that can be validly concluded from the paragraph. These questions provide a paragraph followed by the statement "*From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that*" and five response options. In other questions you may be asked to select the only response option that cannot be validly concluded from the paragraph. These questions provide a paragraph followed by the statement "*From the information given above, it **CANNOT** be validly concluded that*" and five response options.

Pay attention to negated verbs (for example, "are <u>not</u>") and negative prefixes (for example, "<u>in</u>complete" or "<u>dis</u>organized"). Also pay special attention to words such as "all," "none," and "some." Keep in mind that, in some tests, words such as "all" and "none" often give away incorrect response options. That is **not** the case in this test. Some correct answers have the words "all" or "none" in them.

1. The Supreme Court's power to invalidate legislation that violates the Constitution is a strong restriction on the powers of Congress. If an Act of Congress is deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, then the Act is voided. Unlike a presidential veto, which can be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the House and the Senate, a constitutional ruling by the Supreme Court must be accepted by the Congress.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that

A) if an Act of Congress is voided, then it has been deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court
B) if an Act of Congress has not been voided, then it has not been deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court
C) if an Act of Congress has not been deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, then it is voided
D) if an Act of Congress is deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, then it is not voided
E) if an Act of Congress has not been voided, then it has been deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court

The correct answer is response B. The essential information in the paragraph is contained in the second sentence, which states that if an Act of Congress has been deemed unconstitutional, then it is voided. In response B, we are told that an Act of Congress is **not** voided; therefore, we can conclude that it has **not** been deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Response A is not supported by the paragraph because the paragraph does not indicate whether an Act of Congress is voided **only** when it has been deemed unconstitutional or if it could be voided for other reasons. Response C, like response A, cannot be inferred from the paragraph because the paragraph does not indicate whether or not an Act of Congress would be voided if the Supreme Court did not declare it to be unconstitutional. Responses D and E are incorrect because they both contradict the paragraph.

2. Law enforcement agencies use scientific techniques to identify suspects and to establish guilt. One obvious application of such techniques is the examination of a crime scene. Some substances found at a crime scene yield valuable clues under microscopic examination. Clothing fibers, dirt particles, and even pollen grains may reveal important information to the careful investigator. Nothing can be overlooked because all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that

A) all substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination are substances found at a crime scene
B) no potential sources of evidence are substances found at a crime scene
C) some substances found at a crime scene are not potential sources of evidence
D) some potential sources of evidence are substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination
E) some substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination are not substances found at a crime scene

The correct answer is response D. The essential information in the paragraph is contained in the third and fifth sentences. The third sentence tells us that "some substances found at a crime scene yield valuable clues under microscopic examination." The fifth sentence explains that "...all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence." Therefore, we can conclude that "some potential sources of

evidence are substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination." Response A **cannot** be inferred because the paragraph does not support the statement that all substances which yield valuable clues are found exclusively at a crime scene. It may be that valuable clues could be found elsewhere. Responses B and C are incorrect because they contradict the fifth sentence of the paragraph, which clearly states that "all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence." Response E is incorrect because the paragraph provides no information about the value of substances found somewhere other than at the crime scene.

3. A rapidly changing technical environment in government is promoting greater reliance on electronic mail (e-mail) systems. As the use of e-mail grows, there are increasing chances of conflict between the users' expectations of privacy and public access rights. In some investigations, access to all e-mail, including those messages stored in archival files and messages outside the scope of the investigation, has been sought and granted. In spite of this, some people send messages through e-mail that would never be said face-to-face or written formally.

*From the information given above, it **CANNOT** be validly concluded that*

A) some e-mail messages that have been requested as part of investigations have contained messages that would never be said face-to-face
B) some messages that people would never say face-to-face are sent in e-mail messages
C) some e-mail messages have been requested as part of investigations
D) e-mail messages have not been exempted from investigations
E) some e-mail messages contain information that would be omitted from formal writing

This question asks for the conclusion that is **NOT** valid. That means that four of the statements are valid conclusions while one is not. Response B is a valid conclusion because it restates a fact given in the last sentence of the paragraph. Response E is valid because it restates the other fact in the last sentence of the paragraph. The next-to-last sentence in the paragraph is the source of both response C and response D. Both of these choices restate information in that sentence, based on the fact that access to e-mail messages was sought and granted. This leaves only the first option, response A. This is the only choice that does **NOT** represent a valid conclusion. Even though we know from the paragraph that there is a group of e-mail messages that are requested in investigations and also that there is a group of messages that contain information that people would not say face-to-face, there is nothing that says that these groups overlap. We simply do not know from the information presented in the paragraph.

REASONING WITH INCOMPLETE INFORMATION

Immigration Officers frequently must make decisions and draw conclusions when they have incomplete information. In such cases, their conclusions have some probability of being true, but they are not definitely true. In each of the questions of this type, you will be presented with a paragraph of information and five response options. Your task is to select the response option that can be validly concluded from the information given in the paragraph. Use **only** the information provided in the paragraph. Do not speculate or make assumptions that go beyond this information. Also, assume that all information given in the paragraph is true, even if it conflicts with some fact that is known to you. Keep in mind that each question has only **one** correct answer.

4. The alphanumeric coding of a fingerprint is a systematic description of the main patterns on the print. Within a certain metropolitan district, 90% of the population have fingerprints that can be

alphanumerically coded.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that the fingerprints of a person from this district, selected at random,

A) can be alphanumerically coded, with a probability of 10%
B) can be alphanumerically coded, with a probability of less than 90%
C) cannot be alphanumerically coded, with a probability of 10%
D) cannot be alphanumerically coded, with a probability of up to 90%
E) may be coded alphanumerically, but the probability is unknown

The correct answer is response C. We know from the second sentence that 90% of the people in this district have fingerprints that can be coded. Therefore, we know that 10% (100%-90%=10%) have fingerprints that cannot be coded. Given this information, the chance of selecting a person from this district with fingerprints that can be coded is 90% and the chance of selecting a person from this district with fingerprints that cannot be coded is 10%. Response A is incorrect because a probability of 10% is an underestimate of the probability that the fingerprints of a person from this district can be coded. Response B is incorrect because, like response A, it is an underestimate. Response D is incorrect because it is an overestimate of the probability that the fingerprints of a person from this district cannot be coded. Response E is incorrect because the probability that the fingerprints can be coded is known to be 90%.

5. The printed output of some computer-driven printers can be recognized by forensic analysts. The "Acme Model 200" printer was manufactured using two different inking mechanisms, one of which yields a "Type A" micropattern of ink spray around its characters. Of all Acme Model 200 printers, 70% produce this Type A micropattern, which is also characteristic of some models of other printers. Forensic analysts at a crime lab have been examining a kidnap ransom note which clearly exhibits the Type A micropattern.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that this note

A) was printed on an Acme Model 200 printer, with a probability of 70%
B) was printed on an Acme Model 200 printer, with a probability of 30%
C) was not printed on an Acme Model 200 printer, with a probability of 70%
D) was not printed on an Acme Model 200 printer, with a probability of 30%
E) may have been printed on an Acme Model 200 printer, but the probability cannot be estimated

The correct answer is response E. We know from the third sentence that the Type A micropattern exists in 70% of all Acme Model 200 printers and in some other models of printers. However, we know neither how many other models nor what percentage of other models use the Type A micropattern. Hence, the probability that the note was printed on the Acme Model 200 printer cannot be determined. For that reason, responses A, B, C, and D are incorrect because the probability is based only on the characteristic of the one model printer that we know, the Acme Model 200, and not on all of the printer models that contain the Type A micropattern.